



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, MARCH 14, 1914

No. 19

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.98 I urged that discourses concerning the proper teaching of the Classics, especially such as exhort us to teach the Classics as literature, should be made far more specific, far more concrete.

While that editorial was awaiting publication, a valued subscriber, who prefers to remain nameless, wrote to me as follows:

In a recent number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY you say that you have been awaiting help and suggestions from teachers and that they have not given as much aid as you would like. I have a point to suggest as a topic for an editorial, though I can hardly imagine that you have not noticed the thing yourself. The common tendency of writers on classical teaching is towards destructive criticism, and towards suggestions so vague and hard to grasp as to make them of practically no value as constructive criticism.

The writer mentioned several articles, one of which had appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, as exhibiting the characteristics that seemed to him so unfortunate. He then continued:

The content of all these is such as to make it not simply desirable, but imperative, that the criticisms be followed by specific instructions for the betterment of the ills described. Anyone who has had Summer School students who are teachers knows how pitifully lacking they often are in training, and yet how very ready to welcome helpful suggestions. In our four or five hundred Colleges in this country, there are certainly many of the less well-equipped teachers, and teachers remote from libraries of size or from sources of helpful information. To these the vagueness of such articles as I have mentioned must seem baffling, a rock of offence; and I venture to say they probably seem much the same to many of the better equipped teachers who happen not to have the point of view of the writers. They make me think of a physician who might tell a patient, 'You are suffering from such and such an ailment', and then dismiss the patient without an intelligible prescription. Mr. —'s address is very interesting, it must have been inspiring to listen to it, but how many of our classical teachers can get much definite help from it, to say nothing of reforming their teaching in the light of his suggestions? Are we not too prone to talk in -isms, humanism, humanitarianism and the rest, when to most of us these words are beautifully vague in the application we are supposed to make of them?

In a somewhat similar way, does it not happen only too frequently that at conventions and similar meetings some scholar of repute makes a helpful address

and then refuses to have the address published in some medium that would bring it not only to those that could not attend the convention but also to those who were present and who would like to read it over carefully, when free from the fatigue and confusion attendant on a convention. I know the answers these gentlemen would probably make; but does not the greater argument lie with the Association that invited these men to address it?

Since the editorial was published, three of our readers have written to me about it. With their permission I quote them. Professor Rolfe writes:

I think your attitude towards 'Introductions' is absolutely sound and just. I have had a hand in some myself, directly and indirectly, and I cannot recall one which was taken bodily from the handbooks, or on which the writer did not spend enough time and thought to make the Introduction worth while in itself. It is hardly to be supposed that High School students, even if they had access to all the books, as of course they have not, could get, without great loss of time, if at all, what is given them in a good Introduction.

Professor McDaniel writes:

Your last editorial commends itself to me thoroughly. You have stated the truth aptly and cogently. No dictum has appeared from anybody in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY that I could wish so widely repeated as what you say about being specific. I am weary beyond expression of pedagogical articles on literary teaching, etc., that do not offer one single instance of what the author himself *does*. Destructive papers are ruining our classical work and require little brains or originality to write. For our next meeting, I hope it will be insisted that all papers must offer constructive suggestions to be acceptable.

Dr. C. H. Forbes, of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., writes at greater length:

The game of criticism is delightful when the deal passes around the table. How good it feels to name our trump and play the hand with a dummy. We sometimes win, we sometimes block the opponents; but there is fun in the game all the time, and especially when a finesse goes through. Just now the trump was called High School Texts in Latin, though some of us felt it strangely like the new-fangled Nullos; it seemed such an effort to lose something. Well, it was pleasantly played and had a few interesting moments while the lead was up to weakness. Now, however, that the hands are turned we feel a suspicion of a revoke somewhere. Let's put the cards on the table and look the hand over. Wasn't there a bit of confusion about the trump? Surely it was not called 'Doctors' Theses' at

the start, but merely a thing *pueris virginibusque*.

Is it then so despicable a thing for an editor to be an editor, a compiler of good things, even though he is not "in a position to guarantee their accuracy as the result of his own researches"? So we must not congest or arrange information: we must make it! This way to the back seats, my fellow-teachers! Who among us will venture to "guarantee" the "accuracy" of a Mommsen, a Huelsen, a Mau, a Jordan, a Richter, or the Pauly-Wissowa by his "own researches"? High School students can hardly be sent to revel in these books and "do the very thing that the editor did". It is high time that we dropped this exalted talk. These big scholars do our research work—we try to understand them and transmit their results to less seasoned minds. Furthermore, where are the authoritative reference books in English done by these researchers of guaranteed powers? Bless my soul, all we have are made in the same way—intelligent summaries of other men's investigations. Professor Knapp is sound as a nut here, as usually. These blessed reference works of unimpeachable integrity and grave-faced authority are not on every teacher's five-foot shelf. There's many a good fellow who is glad of a decent short summary upon which to hang his own elucidations.

Yes, the 'Notes' are abominable to the man who knows; but the young pupil feels still as we all have felt when we attacked a new page—it wasn't half bad to get a suggestion from some old mellowed reader. Who does not love the memory of Professor Lane for the genius that made a Latin Grammar, for once, sparkle with light?

We all get different impressions from teaching experience; one of mine is that young boys have a lamentable ignorance of English vocabulary. The choice of words is possible only when the words are known. It is, therefore, not a wholly gratuitous work to give a few suggestions leading to a wider acquaintance with words that will make a later choice a possibility. The man who teaches Latin on the premise that English is a known tongue will do well to keep outside the preparatory fence. Doubtless we overdo the thing in school-books of all kinds, but the harm is not so very serious. Let's try to do better, boys!

Now for the strictures on grammar. We should like to omit most of the grammatical notes after leaving Caesar's camp, but there is the beast in the way—the ogre at the college doors. We can't drop the grammar; it's of the stuff that moth and rust do corrupt, and the fabric becomes woefully perforated if laid aside for a season. The teacher should do the work in class? Yes, verily, but he will have a hard task if the student isn't driven to his grammar at his desk. Perhaps the 'Note' doesn't drive him? Well, then it isn't doing any serious harm, certainly.

To conclude, we are all indebted to Mr. Radin for a poke in the ribs and are ready to say with him: 'Give the author a chance, Mr. Editor, throttle yourself a bit, and above all quit talking.' C. K.

PAUSANIAS AS AN HISTORIAN

(Concluded from page 144)

While Pausanias was working out his scheme of general history, he had also the individual history of Athens to consider. Consequently, after some three chapters of periegetical matter, dealing es-

pecially with Theseus, whose deeds, like a silver thread, run throughout the Attica, appearing in twenty-three of the forty-four chapters, he gives an excursus (1.20.4) on the devastation of Athens by Sulla (86 B.C.); but concludes with the comforting statement that the city blossomed forth again under Hadrian.

But Pausanias realized that something more than the Athenian history in the above mentioned biographies was required in order to make the Hellenistic period intelligible, and so, in 1.25.2, in connection with Olympiodorus, he gives a sketch of Athenian history from the battle of Chaeronea (338 B.C.) to Olympiodorus (287 B.C.), in which he points out how Philip II crippled Athens by depriving her of most of her islands and her naval power, after which there followed a period of peace, until, upon the death of Alexander, the Lamian War under the leadership of Leosthenes broke out and the long and ineffectual struggle to throw off the Macedonian yoke began. Finally, however, Cephisodorus (1.36.5. ff.) with his diplomacy (an Athenian exaggeration) succeeded in bringing Roman aid against Philip V, whose defeat at Cynocephalae (197 B.C.) was so complete, that Perseus's defeat at Pydna (168 B.C.) and the final overthrow of the Macedonian power was a natural consequence. This digression near the end of the Attica rounds off the history of the Athenian wars of Macedonia, and, while it is a prognostic of the final subjugation of Greece under Rome, it brings the history of Athens and Greece to the point where, in 7.10, the more detailed history of the Achaean League begins; it is repeated there in substance.

Book 2 begins naturally and conveniently with Corinth, the scene of the final conquest by Rome, and Pausanias's brief notice of this and his account of the new Corinth seem eminently fitting for his plan, although he has been criticized for this restriction. A little later, in connection with Sicyon, we find four out of some seven Teubner pages of the historical matter in this book devoted to Aratus and the beginning of the political expansion of the Achaean League. Aratus even helped to free Attica of the Macedonian garrisons. In general, the second book, properly called Argolica, impresses us as dealing with a series of detached communities, loosely held together by their relations to Argos. The recognition that the heroic age was the most glorious period in the history of Argos (cf. 7.17.1; Herod. 1.1), which was before the Achaeans under Tisamenus migrated to Achaea, as related 2.18.9, sheds glory on the latter. Mythology is not included in the introduction of Book 7.

The introduction to the Laconica (Book 3) is the first long systematic historical account. It occupies twenty-five Teubner pages and serves, in a measure, as a general history of Greece. The wealth of monu-